

MARIA SIGALA, et al.,	)	Case No.: 1:22-cv-00106-DAD-BAK (EPG)
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY ACTION
	)	SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR FAILURE
v.	)	TO COMPLY WITH THE COURT’S ORDERS
	)	
CITY OF MCFARLAND, et al.,	)	[21-DAY DEADLINE]
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

The Local Rules, corresponding with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, provide, “[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with . . . any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” Local Rule 110. “District courts have inherent power to control their dockets” and, in exercising that power, may impose sanctions, including dismissal of an action. *Thompson v. Housing Auth., City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action, obey a court order, or comply with local rules. *See, e.g., Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with a court order to amend a complaint); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130-31 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply

1 with a court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure  
2 to prosecute and to comply with local rules).

3 Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** the plaintiff to show cause in writing, **within 21 days** of the  
4 date of service of this order, why this action should not be dismissed for failure to comply with the  
5 Court's orders. Alternatively, within that same time, the plaintiff may file a motion for appointment of  
6 a guardian ad litem.

7 **The failure to comply with this order will result in a recommendation that the Court**  
8 **dismiss the action.**

9  
10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: **June 21, 2022**

12 /s/ Eric P. Grogan  
13 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28